# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

DANNY SEARLES, by his pother, and next friend Susan Searles, SUSAN SEARLES, and	138	15 MLW	
GLEN SEARLES, and	)		
Plaintiff,	Ć		
v.  DEBORAH STONE, PHYLLIS JEWETT, and GROTON-DUNSTABLE REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT Defendant	) ) ) ) ) ) )	C.A. No.	RECEIPT #AMOUNT \$ 25000 SUMMONS ISSUED WITH LOCAL RULE 4.1 WAIVER FORM MCF ISSUED BY DPTY/CLK. TOWN DATE A 14 0 5

### NOTICE OF REMOVAL PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §1441(a)

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS:

Petitioner, Groton-Dunstable Regional School District ("Defendant"), respectfully petitions this Court for removal of the above-entitled action to the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, Civil Section, from the Superior Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in and for Middlesex County, and for its Notice of Removal state as follows:

The defendant, Groton-Dunstable Regional School District is one of three named defendants by the plaintiffs, Danny Searles, Susan Searles and Glenn Searles ("plaintiffs"), in a civil action filed in the Superior Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in and for Middlesex County, entitled <u>Danny Searles</u>, by his mother and next friend Susan Searles et al. v. Deborah Stone et al., Civil Action No. 05-1845. On August 17, 2005, the defendant, Groton-Dunstable Regional School District, was served in-hand with a Summons and a copy of plaintiff's Complaint.

- The defendant, Groton-Dunstable Regional School District has not yet answered the original Complaint, nor has an appearance been filed on Defendant's behalf.
- 2. This is a suit of a wholly civil nature brought in a Massachusetts state court. The action is pending in Middlesex County, Massachusetts, and, accordingly, under 28 U.S.C. §§101 & 1441(a), the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts is the proper forum for removal.
- 3. This is an action in which the plaintiffs allege, among other things, that the defendants, violated plaintiffs' due process and Fourth Amendment rights and, accordingly, should be held liable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
- Because this case involves federal constitutional issues and claims for relief under federal law, the District Court has original jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331.
- 5. The defendant is filing this Notice within thirty days of service of the Summons and original Complaint upon the defendant, Groton-Dunstable Regional School District, within thirty days of the date this case became removable, and within the time for filing this petition. See 28 U.S.C. §1446. See Copy of Complaint and Summons attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 6. All defendants in this action have consented to removal.
- 7. The defendant will file a Notice of Filing of this Notice of Removal and a copy of this Notice of Removal with the Clerk of the Superior Court of Massachusetts, County of Middlesex.

Pursuant to Local Rule 81.1(a), the petitioner shall request of the Clerk of the 8. Superior Court of Massachusetts, County of Middlesex, certified or attested copies of all records and proceedings in the state court and certified or attested copies of all docket entries therein, and shall file the same with this Court within thirty days after the filing of this Notice of Removal.

Document 1

WHEREFORE, petitioner, Groton-Dunstable Regional School District, prays that the above action now pending in the Superior Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in and for Middlesex County be removed from that Court to this United States District Court.

Respectfully submitted,

The Defendant, Groton-Dunstable Regional School District, By its attorneys,

PIERCE, DAVIS & PERRITANO, LLP

David C. Hunter, BBO #647686 John J. Davis, BBO # 115890

Ten Winthrop Square Boston, MA 02110

(617) 350-0950

Date: September 6, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this day a true copy of the above document was served upon each attorney of record, or pro se litigant, by mail/by hand.

TO PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY: PLEASE CIRCLE TYPE OF ACTION INVOLVED: —

TORT — MOTOR VEHICLE TORT — CONTRACT —

EQUITABLE RELIEF — OTHER

#### COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

MIDDLESEX (seal)	,	SS	
1 accu			

SUPERIOR COURT
DEPARTMENT
OF THE
TRIAL COURT
CIVIL ACTION
No.

05-1845

Clerk

DANNY SEARLES, et als. Plaintiff(s)

DEBORAH STONE, et als. PHYLLIS JEWETT and

, Defendant(s)

Surl J Sullers

GROTON-DUNSTABLE REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

#### **SUMMONS**

10 the above-hamed Delegation. Overload Delegation 1
You are hereby summoned and required to serve upon Jeffrey N. Roy
One Exeter Plaza, Boston, MA 02116
served upon you, within 20 days after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you
fail to do so, judgment by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You are also
required to file your answer to the complaint in the office of the Clerk of this court at Lowell
either before service upon plaintiff's attorney or within a
reasonable time thereafter.
Unless otherwise provided by Rule 13(a), your answer must state as a counterclaim any claim which you may
have against the plaintiff which arises out of the transaction or occurrence that is the subject matter of the plaintiff's
claim or you will thereafter be barred from making such claim in any other action.  Barbara J. Rousa  Witness, Suzame V. Del Vocchio, Esquire, atLowell.
the31stday ofAugust
in the year of our Lord 2005

NOTES.

1. This summons is issued pursuant to Rule 4 of the Massachusetts Rules of Civil Procedure.

2. When more than one defendant is involved, the names of all such defendants should appear in the caption. If a separate summons is used for each defendant, each should be addressed to the particular defendant.

#### COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

MIDDLESEX, ss.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TRIAL COURT C.A. NO. 05–1845

DANNY SEARLES, by his mother PILED and next friend Susan Searles, MAHE OFFICE OF THE SUSAN SEARLES, and CLERK OF THE CLARTS FORTMECOUNTY OF MIDDLESES GLENN SEARLES. Plaintiffs, ) VS. DEBORAH STONE, PHYLLIS JEWETT, and **GROTON-DUNSTABLE REGIONAL** SCHOOL DISTRICT. Defendants.

#### COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

#### The Parties

- 1. Plaintiff Danny Searles is a natural person residing in Groton. Middlesex County, Massachusetts. As he is a minor, this action is brought in his behalf by his mother and next friend Susan Searles.
- 2. Plaintiff Susan Searles is a natural person residing in Groton. Middlesex County, Massachusetts.
- 3. Plaintiff Glen Searles is a natural person residing in Groton, Middlesex County, Massachuseus.
- Defendant Deborah Stone is a natural person residing at 60B Broad Street, Hollis.
   New Hampshire 03049.
  - 5. Plaintiffs' causes of action against defendant Stone arise from defendant's:

- a. transacting business in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;
- b. contracting to supply services or things in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;
- causing tortious injury by an act or omission in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;
- d. causing tortious injury in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by an act or omission outside of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and regularly doing and soliciting business, and engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, and deriving substantial revenue from goods used or consumed or services rendered in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; or
- e. having an interest in, using or possessing real property in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
- 6. Defendant Groton-Dunstable Regional School District is a regional school district formed pursuant to Mass. G.L. c. 71 §§ 14-16 (hereinafter referred to as the "District"). The District has its principal place of business at the Tarbell School. P.O. Box 729, 73 Pepperell Road. West Groton, Middlesex County, Massachusetts.
- 7. Defendant Phyllis Jewett is a natural person residing at 130 Main Street, Townsend.

  Middlesex County, Massachusetts, 01469.

#### Factual Allegations Common to All Counts

8. On August 21, 2003, Danny Scarles, a developmentally-disabled eleven-year old boy failed to show up for school. Instead of dropping Danny off at school, his bus driver, the Defendant Deborah Stone, left Danny restrained in a sweltering school bus for over six hours,

- 9. Danny is a profoundly developmentally-disabled eleven year old boy with limited cognitive abilities. In addition to brain damage, which he was born with, Danny suffers from epilepsy. He is immobile and must be transported in a wheelchair. Danny is incapable of communicating or caring for himself.
- 10. On August 11, 2003, Danny began attending a school at Children's Extended Care Center in Groton, a facility affiliated with Children's Hospital in Boston.
- 11. Until the time of the incident, Danny was provided with transponation to and from Children's Extended Care Center by the Groton-Dunstable Regional School District.
- 12. In particular, every school day, a bus driver employed by the District would arrive at Danny's house in the morning. The driver would then load Danny into a District-owned van equipped with a wheelchair ramp, and secure him with seatbelts and/or strapping. After loading Danny, the driver would deliver Danny to Children's Extended Care Center.
- 13. The distance from Danny's home to Children's Extended Care Center is approximately three miles.
- 14. Because the route is generally free from traffic, the travel time from Danny's home to Children's Extended Care Center is ten minutes or less.
- 15. Following the completion of a school day, the driver would deliver Danny back to his home.
- 16. Defendant Stone had been employed as a special education bus driver by the District since February 2003.

Filed 09/06/2005

- 17. Beginning on or around August 19, 2003, Danny's normal driver, Holly Muggleston, was on vacation. Defendant Stone was the substitute driver for Danny during the week of the incident.
- 18. During the week of the 19th and, in particular, on the 21st, Danny was the only child transported in the van operated by Stone.
- 19. Prior to August 19, 2003, Stone had never driven Danny's route and had never driven a wheelchair equipped special education van.
- 20. Stone received no special training or instruction from District officials before taking over Ms. Muggleston's route and van. Instead, Ms. Muggleston informally showed Stone how to operate the wheelchair van and allowed Stone to accompany her on the route in the week before her vacation.
- 21. Stone kept the non-wheelchair special education van she normally drove parked at her home. Accordingly, during the week of the 19th, she drove that van to the Roach School's parking lot, located off Main Street in Groton, where the wheelchair van was kept. She parked her usual van in the parking lot and drove the wheelchair van on Ms. Muggleston's route.
- 22. After delivering Danny (prior to the 21st) to Children's Extended Care Center, she would return the wheelchair van to the parking lot, retrieve her normal special education van, and then drive back to her home in Hollis, NH, where she would do farm work until it was time to pick up Danny from school.
- 23. In the afternoon, she would repeat the process of exchanging vans, delivering Danny, and exchanging vans again.

- 24. At approximately 9:00 am on the 21st, Stone arrived at the Plaintiffs' home to pick up Danny.
- 25. Stone loaded Danny into the wheelchair van and secured him in the back corner on the driver's side. There are no visual obstructions between the driver's seat and where Danny was located.
- 26. Stone never delivered Danny to his school at Children's Extended Care. Instead, she drove to the Roach School parking lot complex and parked the wheelchair van (leaving Danny inside), picked up her usual van, and drove to the Main Street Café in Groton, where she met her supervisor Phyllis Jewett for coffee.
- 27. Before leaving the wheelchair van in the Roach School lot, Stone did not check the van to ensure she had delivered Danny to his school.
  - 28. After approximately thirty minutes at the Café, Stone drove back to Hollis.
- 29. Meanwhile, Danny was trapped inside the wheelchair van in the parking lot of the school complex unable to move, free himself, or call out for help.
- 30. The van was parked in a space behind which is a small tree. The tree, however, provides no shade.
  - 31. The day was hot and humid with temperatures at or above ninety degrees.
- 32. As Danny remained trapped in the van, unable to help himself, his internal temperature began to rise to dangerously high levels.
- 33. After approximately six hours, Stone returned to the Roach lot and retrieved the wheelchair van. apparently unaware that she had left Danny in the van all day.

Filed 09/06/2005

- 34. She proceeded to Children's Extended Care Center, apparently believing she had dropped Danny off in the morning.
- 35. During the one mile journey from the Roach lot to Children's Extended Care Center, Stone did not see Danny in the rear corner of the van, where she had restrained him earlier in the day.
- 36. Upon arriving at Danny's school at approximately 3:15pm, Stone was confronted by Danny's teacher, Cathy Mencer. Ms. Mencer asked why Danny had not come to school that day. Stone stated she had dropped him off. When Ms. Mencer insisted that this had not occurred, Stone was confused and said "What have I done?" and drove back toward the Roach school lot.
- 37. After a short distance. Stone saw Danny's head lolling just above the seats. She backed up to Children's Extended Care Center and told Ms. Mencer that Danny had been left in the van all day.
- 38. Mencer and other staff at the Center, including the school nurse, took Danny out of the van and began to administer first aid and attempted to bring his temperature down.
- 39. Danny's temperature reached at least 104.4°F, and he had limp arms, a limp neck, pale white skin with pink blotches on his arms, and saliva coming from his mouth. Danny was unresponsive and lethargic. In addition, Danny had bruising on his neck from chafing against the wheelchair restraints in the school van.
  - 40. An ambulance came and rushed Danny to Nashoba Valley Hospital.
- 41. At around the same time, Danny's parents were contacted by staff from Children's Extended Care and informed of the incident.
  - 42. They arrived at the hospital at 3:30pm shortly after Danny arrived by ambulance.

- 43. When she saw Danny and his condition, Mrs. Searles became hysterical and had to be taken to another room.
- 44. Based upon their visual observations of Danny, and the information they had received, both Mr. and Mrs. Searles expected that their child would die from the severe heat exposure.
- 45. That expectation coupled with Danny's physical appearance and obvious suffering caused both parents extreme emotional distress and anguish.
  - 46. The staff at Nashoba Valley succeeded in bringing Danny's temperature down.
- 47. Testing at Nashoba Valley revealed that Danny had elevated levels of creatine kinase indicating brain injury.
- 48. Danny was transported to North Shore Children's Hospital for closer supervision and treatment.
  - 49. Danny was hospitalized for several days due to the incident.
- 50. The Middlesex District Attorney charged Defendant Stone with criminal child endangerment.
- 51. On February 12, 2004, Stone pleaded guilty and was sentenced to two year's probation and is barred from driving a school bus for life.
- 52. Prior to the incident, the District had promulgated "SPED Van Driver Training". That training includes familiarizing new drivers with locations of schools in the district and teaching the driver the route with either the current driver or the transportation manager as the instructor.
  - 53. The training policy indicates that "at least three days of live training is required."

- 54. The SPED Van Driver Training also instructs drivers on maintenance of a daily vehicle inspection log and daily cleaning of the vehicle.
- 55. The district also established "Special Education Transportation Operating Procedures." Those procedures required, among other things, a daily safety check of the vehicle prior to operation, completion of a vehicle log, and "at the conclusion of each run (AM & PM) check[ing] the vehicle for personal items, cleanliness, and safety hazards."
- 56. Though the District has established the procedures, high-ranking officials of the District have indicated that policies with regard to checking the school bus after a morning drop-off were not regularly followed.
- 57. Neither policy by its terms requires the driver to check to make sure all students have been dropped off as scheduled and that no students remained on the bus. Neither policy requires drivers to speak with local school officials when dropping students off.
- 58. Pursuant to the Massachusetts Tort Claims Act. Plaintiffs are required to make presentment of their claims to the Defendant District.
- 59. On November 14, 2003, Plaintiffs made presentment by mailing a letter outlining the claims made in this complaint to Jeanne Niemoller, President of the Groton Dunstable Regional School Board as well as the other members of the Groton Dunstable Regional School Board, "A copy of the letter was sent to the Superintendent of the School District. Dr. Mary Athey Jennings. as well as the Selectmen of Groton and Dunstable.
- 60. The Massachusetts Tort Claims Act requires the presentment letter be sem to the appropriate executive official of the governmental entity. Niemoller and the other members of the Circion Dunstable Regional School Board are executive officers of the Defendant District.

- 61. Pursuant to the terms of Mass. G. L. c. 258, § 4, the Defendant District had six months in which to respond to Plaintiffs' presentment after which time Plaintiffs are allowed to bring suit.
  - 62. Defendant District has not contacted Plaintiffs since receiving the presentment letter.
- 63. Plaintiffs have made proper presentment and satisfied all the prerequisites for bringing claims under the Massachusetts Tort Claims Act.

#### COUNT 1 - NEGLIGENCE AGAINST DEBORAH STONE

- 64. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated into this count by reference.
- 65. Stone had a duty of delivering Danny safely to school each day.
- 66. Stone breached that duty by failing to deliver him to his school and by leaving Danny trapped in a sweltering school bus for hours.
- 67. By reason of the foregoing negligent acts or omissions, plaintiff Danny Searles suffered and will continue to suffer great pain of both body and mind. He has undergone and will continue to undergo medical and hospital care and treatment. His ability to enjoy life and to engage in his usual activities have all been permanently and adversely affected.

#### COUNT 2 - NEGLIGENCE AGAINST THE DISTRICT AND JEWETT

- 68. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated into this count by reference.
- 69. The District and Defendant Jewett had a duty to provide Danny with safe transport to school each day.
- 70. The District and Jewett breached their duties by failing to adequately train or supervise Stone.

Filed 09/06/2005

- 71. In addition, the District's failure to promulgate policies requiring two daily checks of the van for remaining pupils and to speak with receiving teachers and/or failing to require adherence to such policies is a breach of its duty to Danny and other pupils.
- 72. Moreover, the District's policy, allowing school bus drivers to exchange vans before and after drop-offs, created a foreseeable danger that drivers would forget to drop off disabled children and thus was a breach of the District's duty to Danny and other pupils.
- 73. By reason of the foregoing negligent acts or omissions, plaintiff Danny Searles suffered and will continue to suffer great pain of both body and mind. He has undergone and will continue to undergo medical and hospital care and treatment. His ability to enjoy life and to engage in his usual activities have all been permanently and adversely affected.

#### COUNT 3 - RESPONDEAT SUPERIOR AGAINST THE DISTRICT

- 74. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated into this count by reference.
- 75. The District, as the employer of Stone, is vicariously liable for her acts and omissions, occurring during the course and scope of her duties as a driver.
- 76. Accordingly, the District is vicariously liable for Stone's negligent and intentional acts in leaving Danny in the bus for hours, and for the resulting damages.

#### COUNT 4 - NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS AGAINST THE DISTRICT AND DEBORAH STONE

- 77. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated into this count by reference.
- 78. Both Mr. and Mrs. Searles viewed Danny immediately in the hospital following his transport there.

- 79. Upon seeing Danny's poor condition and learning of the incident, both of his parents suffered extreme mental anguish and distress. Both feared their son would die.
- 80. The emotional distress suffered by each has manifested itself in a variety of ways including hysterical screaming and nightmares.
- 81. The distress suffered by Mr. and Mrs. Searles was proximately caused by Stone's, Jewett's, and the District's negligence.

#### COUNT 5 - FALSE IMPRISONMENT AGAINST DEBORAH STONE

- 82. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated into this count by reference.
- 83. Stone intentionally bound Danny to his wheelchair after loading him into the van on August 21, 2003.
  - 84. Danny was prevented from moving or releasing himself.
- 85. Danny's detention became excessive in scope and duration and thus became unlawful, when he was not delivered to school and instead left in the bus all day.
- 86. Danny and his parents suffered extreme physical and emotional pain as a proximate result of the unlawful detention.

# COUNT 6 - VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 1983 BY DEBORAH STONE

- 87. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated into this count by reference.
- 88. Stone, an employee of the District acted under color of state law when she failed to deliver Danny to school.
- 89. Because Danny was her charge and manifestly unable to care for himself. Stone's failure to take precautions against his endangerment constitutes deliberate indifference to his

Filed 09/06/<u>2</u>005

safety in violation of the rights guaranteed him by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

- 90. In addition, Stone's actions in strapping Danny into his place in the van constitute a seizure within the meaning of the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution.
- 91. That seizure was unreasonable both in its duration and the conditions endured by Danny.
  - 92. Stone thus violated Danny's Fourth Amendment rights.
- 93. Stone, acting under color of state law, is liable under 42 U.S.C. §1983 for violating Danny's Fourteenth and Fourth Amendment rights.

# COUNT 7 - MUNICIPAL AND SUPERVISORY LIABILITY UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1983

- 94. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated into this count by reference.
- 95. At the time of the incident, the law was clearly established, and the District and lewett knew or should have known, that leaving a pupil in a swettering bus for hours violated the pupil's Due Process and Fourth Amendment rights.
- 96. The District and Jewett acted with deliberate indifference to the rights of their pupils by failing to train Stone more effectively on her new route, by failing to promulgate policies and procedures for replacement drivers, by failing to promulgate policies regarding checking the van for pupils left on the vans, by failing to promulgate policies and requiring drivers to speak with teachers receiving disabled children, by failing to prohibit special education drivers from exchanging vans before and after driving their routes, and by failing to require adherence to existing policies.

- 97. It would be manifest to any reasonable official that failing to require such training, and failing to have such policies and protections in place would very likely result in a profoundly disabled student like Danny being left on a bus.
- 98. The District's and Jewett's omissions are affirmatively linked to Plaintiffs' injuries. The District promulgated a policy requiring two daily checks of a school bus, but by the acknowledgement of senior District officials, it did not observe such a policy. That laxity, reinforced in the informal and inadequate training given to drivers entrusted with the most vulnerable children, is a tacit approval and purposeful disregard of the possibility that disabled pupils will be trapped in buses.

#### COUNT 8 - VIOLATION OF MASS. G.L. C. 12 §§ 11H, 11I BY STONE AND THE DISTRICT

- 99. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated into this count by reference.
- 100. As alleged, Stone violated Danny's civil rights by seizing him and leaving him in the school bus all day long.
- 101. The District's and Jewett's failure to train Stone and have effective policies in place also caused Plaintiffs' injuries.
- 102. These actions and omissions by Stone, the District, and Jewett constitute violations of the Massachusetts Civil Rights Act.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court:

Award Plaintiffs damages incurred as a result of the wrongful actions and conduct 41. of Defendants:

- b. Award attorneys fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988 and Mass. G.L. c. 12, § 111.
- c. Award such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

#### JURY CLAIM

PLAINTIFFS CLAIM TRIAL BE JURY ON ALL COUNTS.

Plaintiff, By her attorneys,

Jeffrey N. Roy

RAVECH & KOY, P.C.

One Exeter Plaza Boston, MA 02116 (617) 303-0500

BBO #548618

DATED: May 31, 2005

CIVIL ACTION COVER SHEET	DOCKET NO.(S) 05-1	1845	Trial Court of Massac Superior Court Depa County: MIDDLESEX	chusetts ertment
PLAINTIFF(S)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	DEFENDANT(S)		
DANNY SEARLES, et als.		DEBORAH	STONE, et als.	
ATTORNEY FIRM NAME ADDRESS AND TELE Jeffrey N. Roy, Ravech & Roy	PHONE	AFTORNEY (If kno	OWN)	
One Exeter Plaza, Boston, MA		Ì		
Board of Bar Overseers number: 548618				
	Origin code and	track designa	ition	
Place an x in one box only:			District Court Appeal c.231, s.	. 97 &104 (After
1. F01 Original Complaint 2. F02 Removal to Sup.Ct. C.	231 e 104		<ul><li>i) (X)</li><li>5 Reactivated after rescript; relic</li></ul>	of from
(Before trial) (F)	201,0.104		gment/Order (Mass.R.Clv.P. 60)	
3 F03 Retransfer to Sup.Ct. 0	C.231,s.102C (X)		Summary Process Appeal (X)	
	E OF ACTION AND TRACK CTION (specify) TRACK		(See reverse side) A JURY CASE?	
The following is a full, itemiz	gainst municipality A	(X)Ye	te on which plaintiff relies	to determine
money damages. For this for				
	TORT	CLAIMS		
<u> </u>	(Attach additional s	heets ee neces	HE OFFICE OF THE COURTS COUNTY OF MICODESEX	
<ul><li>A. Documented medical expense</li><li>1. Total hospital expenses</li></ul>	s to date:	10.23	OF THE COURTS	\$ 5,677.00
2. Total Doctor expenses		FORTHE	CONFILADE WINDOWS	\$
3. Total chiropractic expens	es		PA 2 1 5005	\$
4. Total physical therapy ex	penses	••••••		\$0.00
5. lotal other expenses (de	scribe)	·····\∵£	Subtotal	\$ 5,677.50
3. Total chiropractic expens 4. Total physical therapy ex 5. Total other expenses (de  B. Documented lost wages and c C. Documented property damage D. Reasonably anticipated future E. Reasonably anticipated lost w E. Other-documented items of da	compensation to date			\$
C. Documented property damage D. Reasonably anticipated future	s to date		**11.**************	
D. Reasonably anticipated future	medical and hospital expens	ses		
E. Reasonably anticipated lost war. Other-documented items of da	images (describe)		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	3
				\$
G. Brief description of plaintiff's in				
On August 21, 2003, plaintiff, a sweltering bus for eight hours,				
elevated levels of creatine kina	_	• •		\$.,,
Cicvetob icvoid of ordatific King	see moleculary brain injury	-	TOTAL	\$.5,677.50
And the state of t	CONTRA	CT CLAIMS		
	(Attach additional s		ssary)	,*
Provide a detailed description of cla	lim(s):			
			TOTAL	<b>\$</b>
PLEASE IDENTIFY, BY CASE NU COURT DEPARTMENT	IMBER, NAME AND COUN	TY. ANY RELA	TED ACTION PENDING IN THE	E SUPERIOR
"I hereby certify that I have com	plied with the requiremen	ts of Rule 5 of	the Supreme Judicial Court	Uniform Rules on
Dispute Resolution (SJC Rule 1 resolution services and discuss	:18) requiring that I provid	e my clients w	ith information about court-c	connected dispute
Signature of Attorney of Record _		$\mathbb{Z}_2$	D/	ATE: 5/31/2005
			O	1 E. 010 1/2000

# Commonwealth of Massachusetts County of Middlesex The Superior Court

CIVIL DOCKET# MICV2005-01845-L

RE: Searles (ppa) et al v Stone et al

TO:Jeffrey N Roy, Esquire Ravech & Roy 699 Boylston Street 1 Exeter Plaza Boston, MA 02116

#### TRACKING ORDER - A TRACK

You are hereby notified that this case is on the average (A) track as per Superior Court Standing Order 1-88. The order requires that the various stages of litigation described below must be completed not later than the deadlines indicated.

## STAGES OF LITIGATION

#### DEADLINE

Service of process made and return filed with the Court	08/29/2005
Response to the complaint filed (also see MRCP 12)	10/28/2005
All motions under MRCP 12, 19, and 20 filed	10/28/2005
All motions under MRCP 15 filed	08/24/2006
All discovery requests and depositions completed	07/20/2007
All motions under MRCP 56 served and heard	09/18/2007
Final pre-trial conference held and firm trial date set	01/16/2008
Case disposed	05/30/2008

The final pre-trial deadline is <u>not the scheduled date of the conference</u>. You will be notified of that date at a later time.

Counsel for plaintiff must serve this tracking order on defendant before the deadline for filing return of service.

This case is assigned to session L sitting in Cv CrtRm (Lowell), Middlesex Superior Court.

Dated: 06/01/2005

Edward J. Sullivan Clerk of the Courts BY: Michael Brennan Assistant Clerk

Location: Cv CrtRm (Lowell) Telephone: 978-453-0201

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

. Т	itle of c	ase (nan	ne of first party on ea	ch side only)	Danny Searles et a	l., v. De	borah Sto	one et al.		
_						* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *				
							6 - 6-0			
			h the case belongs b	ased upon the	numbered nature of s	uit code	e listed or	the civi	l cover sheet.	(See local
rı	ıle 40.1	(a)(1)).			N. 18. 18. 19. 19.	da f				
_		l.	160, 410, 470, R.23	, REGARDLES	S OF NATURE OF SUIT	г.			٠.	
	<u>x</u>	11.			550, 555, 625, 710, 720, 50, 890, 892-894, 895, 95				e AO 30 or A demandor co	
_	_	ul.		345, 350, 355,	230, 240, 245, 290, 310, 360, 362, 365, 370, 371,				D.	
_		IV.	220, 422, 423, 430, 690, 810, 861-865,		610, 620, 630, 640, 650, 900.	, 660,	A	13		
_	_	v.	150, 152, 153.				<b>~</b> %			
	istrict ;				al rule 40.1(g)). If more irst filed case in this co		e prior re	lated cas	se has been fi	led in this
_	N/A					1				
. н	as a pr	ior action	n between the same	parties and ba	sed on the same claim	ever be	en filed i	n this co	urt?	
						YES		. NO	Χ	
	oes the SC §24		int in this case ques	tion the const	itutionality of an act of	congre	ss affectir	ng the pu	blic interest?	(See 28
lf	so, is	the U.S.A	. or an officer, agent	or employee	of the U.Ş. a party?					
						YES		NO		
. Is	this c	ase requi	red to be heard and	determined by	a district court of thre	e judge	s pursuar	nt to title	28 USC §2284	4?
					ŧ	YES		NO	X	
					nmental agencies of th ig in Massachusetts res					
						YES		NO	X	
		A.	lf yes, in which div	rision do <u>all</u> of	the non-governmental	parties	reside?			
			Eastern Division		Central Division	Ļ		West	tern Division	
		В.	If no, in which divi		ajority of the plaintiffs on setts reside?	or the o	nly partie	s, exclud	ling governme	ental
			Eastern Division	X	Central Division			West	tern Division	
			of Removal - are ther e sheet identifying th		pending in the state co	ourt rec	uiring the	attentio	on of this Cou	rt? (If yes,
		-		•		YES		NO	X	
LE	ASE TY	PE OR P	RINT)			0		ν		
ПС	RNEY'	S NAME	David (	C. Hunter, BBC	#647686					
DDF	RESS	Pie	rce, Davis & Perritan	o, lip, Ten Wir	nthrop Square, Boston,	MA 02	110			
	_	E NO.								
			(011) 330-0330							

SS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

# CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

Ett billi doones thees. (BLL E.					1.5/1.18			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	Danny Searles, Susan les, & Glenn Searles	DEFENDANTS Deborah Stone, Phyllis Jewett & Groton-Dunstable Regional						
Sear		School District						
(b) County of Residence		County of Residence	ce of First	Listed Defendant	M			
* *	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)					
					the state of the s	SE THE LOCATION OF THE		
			LAN	ND INVOL	VED.			
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name,	Address, and Telephone Number) Jeffrey	Roy,	Attorneys (If Know	<sup>m)</sup> Day	vid C. Huni	ter & John J.		
	Roy, P.C., One Exeter		Davis: 1			& Perritano, LLP		
	ston, MA 02116					n, MA 02110		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		ITIZENSHIP OI	F PRÍNO		(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff		
1 U.S. Government	₹3 Federal Question		(For Diversity Cases Onl		DEF	and One Box for Defendant)  PTF  DEF		
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citiz	en of This State		1 Incorporated or Proof Business In This	rincipal Place 🔲 4 🗂 4		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity  (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	□ 2 T	2 Incorporated and l of Business In .			
			en or Subject of a reign Country	□ 3 i	3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6		
IV. NATURE OF SUI	(Place an "X" in One Box Only)	1	- Courtery					
CONTRACT	TORTS		(DELLEGRAPIED NAVIOLA		BANKRUPICY			
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane  362 Personal Injury		510 Agriculture 520 Other Food & Drug		2 Appeal 28 USC 158 3 Withdrawal	☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust		
☐ 130 Miller Act	315 Airplane Product Med. Malpractice	. □ 6	i25 Drug Related Seizure	;	28 USC 157	430 Banks and Banking		
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability		of Property 21 USC 88 30 Liquor Laws		OPERI Y RIGHTS	450 Commerce 460 Deportation		
& Enforcement of Judgment	Slander   368 Asbestos Person	al 🗆 6	40 R.R. & Truck	□ 820	0 Copyrights	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and		
☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product Liability Liability		550 Airline Regs. 660 Occupational		0 Patent 0 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations  480 Consumer Credit		
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPER	TY	Safety/Health 90 Other			☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 810 Selective Service		
(Excl. Veterans)  153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability 371 Truth in Lending		LABOR	SC	CIAL SECURITY			
of Veteran's Benefits  160 Stockholders' Suits	□ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 380 Other Personal □ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage		'10 Fair Labor Standards Act		1 HIA (1395ff) 2 Black Lung (923)	Exchange  875 Customer Challenge		
☐ 190 Other Contract	Product Liability 385 Property Damag	e 🗓 7	20 Labor/Mgmt. Relation	ns 🗂 863	3 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	12 USC 3410		
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	☐ 360 Other Personal Product Liability Injury	LJ 7	'30 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act		4 SSID Title XVI 5 RSI (405(g))	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts		
REAL PROPERTY	ECIVIL RICHTS PRISONER PET UTO		40 Railway Labor Act	FF	DERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act		
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vaca ☐ 442 Employment ☐ Sentence		'90 Other Labor Litigation '91 Empl. Ret. Inc.	n   13 870	0 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act		
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus:	-	Security Act	□ 87.	1 IRSThird Party	☐ 895 Freedom of Information		
☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations				26 USC 7609	Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination		
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 540 Mandamus & Ot	her				Under Equal Access		
	Employment	,				to Justice  950 Constitutionality of		
	Other					State Statutes		
V. ORIGIN (Place	☑ 440 Other Civil Rights  an "X" in One Box Only)				· · · · · ·	Appeal to District		
	tate Court Appellate Court	Reor	stated or and	ansferred to other distri- oecify)	ict Multidistr Litigation			
THE CASTOR OF ACTIO	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a			ionai stati	ites uniess diversity):			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of cause: Alleged violation			due	process &	4th Amendment		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23		EMAND \$		CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: right		
VIII. RELATED CAST	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE			DO	OCKET NUMBER			
DATE	SIGNATURE OF A	TORNEY	OF RECORDA					
		(		_				
9/6/05 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	- Land	<u> </u>	41					
RECEIPT# A	MOUNT APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	<u> </u>	MAG. JUI	OGE		